

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 and 15-23 have been rejected. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner allowing Claim 14, if that claim is rewritten in the independent form.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12, 15, 17, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Spatial Data Mining: Progress and Challenges Survey Paper” (Koperski); Claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koperski in view of “Clustering for Mining in Large Spatial Databases” (Ester); and Claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koperski in view of “Finding Aggregate Proximity Relationships and Commonalities in Spatial Data Mining” (Knorr).

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated his acceptance of the arguments set forth in the Amendment filed on March 31, 2004. Koperski’s conventional data mining system cannot cope with search functions described in the present application, making the inventive **calculating** step as recited in all the independent claims, novel. The Examiner further agrees that prior art fails to teach **calculating** a distance or an orientation **requested by a requester**, such as analyzation businesses. Independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 20-23 have been amended in compliance with Examiner’s directive, on page 3 of the present Final Office Action, to include features of the Applicants’ arguments.

Specifically, independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 20-23 were amended to include the following recitations:

“wherein said calculating step is performed upon an input of a request from a requester”,
recited in amended Claims 1, 6, 11, 20, and 23,

“wherein said calculating is performed by said optimal distance calculation means upon an input of a request from a requester”, recited in amended Claim 12;

“wherein said calculating is performed by said optimal orientation calculation means upon an input of a request from a requester”, recited in amended Claim 15;

“wherein said calculating is performed by said optimal distance/orientation calculation means upon an input of a request from a requester”, recited in amended Claim 17;

“wherein said calculating is performed by said orientation block calculation means upon an input of a request from a requester”, recited in amended Claim 21; and

“wherein said calculating is performed by said distance calculation means upon an input of a request from a requester”, recited in amended Claim 22.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 20-23 are believed to overcome the rejection and are now believed to be allowable. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10, 13, 14, 16, and 18-19, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-23 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-23, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants’ attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484